

Again he says that "when we burned the barriers away worldlyism rushed in". All the barriers we burned away was the standing coat collar and the women's bonnet. These things now constitute practically about all that is left of the "order", and these are the things that the Elder is trying so frantically to save. Are these all the things that stand between the Dunkard church and the world? None of these things are mentioned in the Bible. How did it happen that those who gave us the Bible failed to mention that the only salvation of God's people from "worldlyism" was a coat collar, a bonnet, and a little white cap? What supreme absurdity.

Again he says he searches in vain among us for a "semblance of gospel plainness or primitive Christianity". By this he would have us to believe that nothing but a Dunkard coat, a bonnet, or a cap, meets the demands of gospel plainness, and that there is no primitive Christianity except in the garb of an "orderly" Dunkard. Does he believe that the primitive Christians dressed themselves according to Annual Meeting rules, and does he believe that their dress is the only plain dress now worn? Is that the extent of his understanding of such things? I say he *does not believe it*. Then why does he write it? I say to deceive his people and to excite their prejudices against us.

Again he says we have fashionable dressing, secret societies, church festivals, and about everything a worldly-minded person could desire. If current history is not at fault his people are abundantly subject to the same indictment. I wonder if the Elder's wardrobe would withstand his own test. As near as I can remember about all that he wears is fashionable except his coat collar, and that happens to be in the fashionable clerical style. Will the Elder pull out a few beams before he leaves home? We do have festivals sometimes and they are according to Christ's own command. When we make a feast, as a church, we call the poor, &c., as we are commanded. Will the Elder forbid us keeping the Master's saying? But I would like to have the Elder to say what he thinks of that form of worldliness manifested by "adding house to house, farm to farm, herd to herd". I believe there is something said about it somewhere in the Bible. I don't think the Annual Meeting has referred to it very often. Does he know of any Dunkard who exhibits that form of "worldlyism"? The Bible says something about "rising up early and working late and eating the bread of carefulness". It is one phase of "worldlyism". Does the Elder preach or write much about it, and does the Annual Meeting define the limits of covetousness and denounce the sin of insatiable desire for worldly possessions? I have been present at a few Dunkard assemblies for public worship, and "orderly" ones, too, and about all the conversation I heard was about wheat, cattle, poor markets, and on through the list. Will the Elder tell us

what is said about "out of the abundance of the heart". Is that a phase of worldlyism? Who burnt the barriers which let that in?

We come now to the most significant statements of the Elder. He says to us, "plain dressing is a myth, the prayer covering has gone where the woodbine twineth (the graveyard I suppose), the holy kiss is obsolete, feet washing is observed in a corner, the Lord's supper is rapidly assuming the Methodist idea of bread and water, and we have lost the distinctive features of the church of Christ". This is a sweeping indictment and some of it would be sad if it were true. Let me answer. Plain dressing as it is defined by the Dunkard teachers is a myth, but as it was defined and practiced by Christ and the apostles and all men of unquestioned piety and wisdom, is not a myth. The Dunkard prayer covering, the cap, which they evolved out of the fashionable headgear of the women of the eighteenth century has gone to the graveyard of defunct traditions and superstition, but the apostolic prayer covering, the hair, (I Cor. 11:15), is with us still. The holy kiss is yet observed in connection with the Lord's supper, but as a social custom it is not enjoined. Will the Elder tell us when it should be observed, how often, and when its disuse would be allowable? It seems to me I have seen instances, not a few, when his people confined its observance to "corners", a locality he seems to disfavor. Feet washing is not observed in "corners", and the Elder knew as well as any man in America that his charge does not correspond to the facts. Our observance of that ordinance is as open as theirs, and if he has a proper regard for the truths of history he will correct it in his paper. Their may be some congregations who exclude spectators, but he can find such in his own organization. It may be that some congregations have substituted bread and water for beef and soup. If they have, I do not blame them, provided they have enough for supper. The former is the plainer and simpler and has enough nourishment for the occasion. Does the Elder get his beef and soup from the Bible? If not, why does he condemn plain bread and water? We have all the elements of a common meal, but if I had to choose between the Elder's supper and bread and water I would take the latter. It is more scriptural.

If the distinctive features of the church of Jesus Christ is the peculiar Dunkard dress, we have not lost it, because we never had it. If those features are trine immersion, the washing of the saints feet, the love feast, the holy kiss, the wine and bread in memory of Christ's death, preceded by repentance, faith, confession and covenant to take the gospel as our only rule of faith and practice; if these constitute the features of the church of Jesus Christ we have not lost them. If the "order" of Elder Miller's church constitute any part of those features, what sort of a thing was that church before that order was evolved? I remember when the straight

collar was adopted. Was one distinctive feature lacking before that? Can the Elder see the supreme nonsense of his contention?

Then he makes the astounding and wicked statement that "we sacrificed principle for popularity". Does he mean that the "order" of his church is a principle and not a policy, an expedient? Most of his intelligent brethren, such as A. Hutchinson, the Brumbaugh's, and others, consider it in the light of a means to an end, an expedient, one of the constituents of their church polity. Does the Elder know the difference between a principle and a policy? They say plainness is a principle. So say we, but what man of ordinary sense would say that a standing coat collar and cutaway skirt is plainer than other forms? What woman of intelligence will say that a silk bonnet is plainer than a straw hat? If the Elder will not tell his people the facts about our doctrines the fear of God ought to restrain him from distorting them as he has done against light and knowledge.

Now I will tell the Elder how he can rid his church of the evils he denounces. Do as you did before our organization was established. If Progressive practices are such awful departures from the Lord and are bringing ruin on your church, why in the Lord's name don't you expel them? If you allow it to remain why do you denounce us? Remember the saying, "Physician heal thyself."

He wants to know how to win the college brethren back (to the traditions). He says they are not in sympathy with the church. I say they *are* in sympathy with its principles but not with your traditions. Education and intelligence is death to traditions. The Elder knows this. Colleges teach men to think and reason. They open the darkened chambers of the mind and let the light of reason in, and tradition only grows in the darkness. If the Elder wants to counteract Progressive tendencies among his people let him destroy the colleges. Above all let him know that he must stand some time before God's judgment bar and give an account of what he says against us.

Now suppose I would be so uncharitable as to retaliate just a little, how easily I could make out a good case. I will simply ask the Elder a few pertinent questions.

1 Explain why your people have the reputation, well earned, of being the most money-loving and covetous of wealth of all the religious organizations?

2 Explain why, at your Annual Meetings, you carry on a most extensive traffic on Sunday, shocking to all lovers of the sacred day, and contract with transportation companies to bring vast crowds to those meetings on Sunday at so much per capita, on the plea that it helps the missionary cause, thus emphasizing the wicked doctrine that the end justified the means?

3 Is wearing such clothes as are common among the common people evidence of a worldly mind? If it is how do you excuse your brethren who only differ from them in the matter of the collar, and thousands of them not in that, and your sisters in a bit of a fancy bonnet, and thousands of them not in that.

4 Did the apostles teach an "order" of dress? If not, how did they manifest an unworldly spirit.

5 Did any religious organization before 1708